UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA OAKLAND DIVISION

The Land Line D

APR 1 6 2018

United States of America,	Case No. 16-70480 Case No. 16-70480 CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
Plaintiff,)	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Juan Diego Mercado alvares) Defendant.	
	d on, the Court excludes time under the Speedy, and finds that the ends of justice served by the ablic and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § and bases this continuance on the following factors:
Failure to grant a continuance See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)	would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. (I).
defendants, the nature of the proof or law, that it is unreasonable to	omplex, due to [circle applicable reasons] the number of rosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial ablished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, e of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. (iv).
	would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time tion, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. (iv).
	cord, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § onsent of the defendant under Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure
	cord, it is further ordered that time is excluded under 18 U.S.C. § lting from removal/transport of the defendant to another district.
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 4 16 18	Kandis A. Westmore United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney